

series of hearings was held from May 5 to June 4, 1964. Testimony was heard from representatives of all the Government agencies significantly involved with research and development, including the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget, and from representatives of industry, universities, and other nonprofit organizations. The compilation of opinion and data contained in the hearings has been useful to those concerned with one or both of these perplexing problems.

In August 1964 another in our series of reports—"Government and Science No. 3—Scientific-Technical Advice for Congress; Needs and Sources" was issued. This report, a staff study, brought together views, comments, and opinions on this matter as obtained from testimony during the hearings, from a poll of the members of the committee's Panel on Science and Technology, and through the following methods: First, advice from outside expert sources on the kind of scientific and technical information likely to be most useful to the Congress, and ways and means of securing it; second, surveys of those sources—committee staffs, key personnel in the Library of Congress, and executive branch officials—who most often are called upon to provide technical information to Congress; and third, inquiries into sources which had the potential of becoming useful in supplying scientific information and advice to the Congress, such as professional scientific groups, industrial organizations, and the National Academy of Sciences.

Among other specific recommendations were increased use of ad hoc consultant groups; improved liaison with the President's Office of Science and Technology, the National Academy of Sciences, and the proposed National Academy of Engineering; the strengthening of committee staffs; and the strengthening of the scientific and engineering consulting and staff resources of the Legislative Reference Service. One of our most important aspirations is closer cooperation among the different congressional committees which deal with varying facets of the same scientific or technological problems.

Two reports of our subcommittee were completed after the adjournment of the 88th Congress. I believe all Members of Congress will find the observations, conclusions, data and recommendations in our report entitled "Government and Science No. 4: Geographical Distribution of Federal Research and Development Funds" to be of special interest. This is now House Report No. 106 of the current Congress.

As I stated in my letter of transmittal of the report to the committee:

I would like to suggest that the major aim of this report is to help point the way toward the development of useful Federal policies in the support of research and development in the years ahead. We are here studying the past and present in order to help determine what our course should be, not just next year or the year after, but for the decades stretching beyond that. The conclusions contained herein should thus be considered in the light of American society as it will exist in 1970 and beyond.

Members may wish also to refer to a detailed statistical compilation from the National Science Foundation which was prepared at our request and which served as backup data for our study.

In view of the recommendations recently made by President Johnson for elimination of reimbursement limits on science grants, our most recent report entitled "Government and Science No. 5—Indirect Costs Under Federal Research Grants" takes on special meaning. In fact the President's request follows the basic recommendations of our subcommittee in this report—now House Report No. 144 of the current Congress.

When the amount of Federal funds for support of individual research projects was small, institutions could absorb the incidental expenses which were incurred. This is no longer the case. It has been estimated that the percentage of Federal research and development funds spent for research grants is probably between 5 and 8 percent of the total, or between \$750 million and \$1.2 billion. When overhead costs on sums of this magnitude are not recoverable, there are profound and vital effects on the economic stability of the institutions involved and on the administration of many if not most of the Nation's educational institutions.

A serious problem is therefore created by the statutory limitations on reimbursement imposed on certain agencies. It is magnified because others are not so restricted, thereby frustrating efforts by the Bureau of the Budget to develop uniform means of reimbursement.

Our report summarizes the views of the principal interested Government agencies, of witnesses from universities, and of private foundations. It also contains an analysis of single-manager concepts, and a discussion of the idea of cost sharing.

We believe that our hearings and reports will be of continuing benefit to Members of Congress, to executive branch officials, to concerned individuals in industry, and the educational institutions. The process of examination per se may have had beneficial effects upon the Federal agencies who are engaged in research and development activities by forcing them to take a closer look at what their missions and responsibilities are. Our examination of various aspects of the total research and development picture may have enabled Members of Congress who are on committees with responsibility for individual agency oversight to obtain a better appreciation of the overall problem.

I wish to stress one point which has been stated persistently in the introductory remarks for each of our reports; that is, the interim, tentative nature of our conclusions and recommendations. We have been concerned with problems of such complexity and magnitude that we cannot hope to deal conclusively with them in the short space of 18 months.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that much remains to be done. The job is a continuing one. It will never be finished.

At the present time we are about ready to present to the full committee and to

the House the results of two most important studies mentioned earlier. One of these deals with science education at the precollege level and has been done at our request by the National Science Foundation. The other deals with levels and criteria for Federal support of basic research and has been done under contract by the National Academy of Sciences. These studies are in the final stages of processing.

In addition the subcommittee is preparing its course for the current Congress. We have not yet completed our planning. But almost certainly our activities will include further oversight of National Science Foundation operations, an inquiry into the application of research and development techniques as a means of stimulating the national economy, and a beginning look at the potential role of science and technology in combating the problems of population growth.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ELLIS ISLAND NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon). Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, America is truly a nation of immigrants. Her heritage is unique, for in a sense, she is a part of all the nations of the world. To her shores have come literally millions of Europeans, Asians, Africans, and Latins. All came to be Americans and to each America owes some part of her existence as a nation.

In seeking a better life, America's immigrants made immeasurable contributions to a better life in their new country. In all fields of endeavor these new citizens applied their physical and mental energy to help forge the strongest and wealthiest Nation man has ever known. At the same time they lent the flavor of their diverse cultures to help create the great melting pot that is this Nation. They gave us scientists, artists, writers, actors, philosophers, teachers and great men of affairs. Many of their descendants sit in this Congress. I am but one.

While the contribution of immigrants to the strength and nobility of this Nation is unquestioned, we may well ask whether that contribution is sufficiently recognized. The very blood of this Nation is the blood of immigrants, and though we ever benefit from our immigrant forebears, we have never, as a nation, expressed in any lasting sense a tribute to them. I feel most strongly that nothing could be more appropriate than to do so now.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which provides for the establishment of the Ellis Island National Historic Site.

Among the many symbols of our immigrant heritage, one stands out in prominence. Ellis Island was for 62 years the gateway to America. Between 1892, when it was first opened to receive them, and 1954, when its closing marked the end of an era, Ellis Island was the threshold of a new life for more than

March 16, 1965

20 million people. Originally a picnic spot for Dutch colonists, it was pressed into service as a processing station for immigrants when existing facilities proved too small. Yet frequently the island, only 27½ acres in size, was itself not large enough to comfortably accommodate the multitude who passed through it. Conditions were not always pleasant in that unfamiliar place whose people then faced an uncertain future.

But in spite of these hardships, Ellis Island was, and is, a warm place. It represented a reality which before had only existed as a dream. Those who stepped onto Ellis Island would long remember the first hard feel of America under their feet. For many, their first day at Ellis Island was the tangible fulfillment of a life's ambition. For 20 million people, that small island in New York Harbor was America and home.

The closing of Ellis Island in 1954 symbolized the recession of the great immigration to our shores. Those who passed through her gates went forth to become part of the very fiber of this land. In tribute to them and to their inestimable contribution, it is only fitting that Ellis Island be preserved as a monument to its own past and to the future which its people, and all America's immigrants, built.

Many have said that they would act, but have delayed. I urge that we delay no longer and therefore propose that Ellis Island be enshrined as a national historic site, dedicated to the immigrants of America. This island would serve as a memorial to an important and meaningful part of our country's history. It would symbolize, too, like its close neighbor, the Statue of Liberty, the freedom and opportunity which millions around the world sought and found in America.

I believe very strongly that the memory of the history of Ellis Island—and all that it symbolizes—should never be allowed to fade. For perhaps more than any other monument we have, it would well remind us that the nobility to which we have risen was born of humble origins.

But the island should not only be a memorial to the many who came to this country seeking a better life, it should also be an opportunity to those who are now seeking a better life. I would also suggest that my bill presents Secretary Udall and OEO Director Shriver with an excellent opportunity for combining two programs. The work that must be done on the site should be done by the Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This would provide many youths in the New York-New Jersey area with the opportunity of engaging in work which would be meaningful to them not only in its actual accomplishment, but also from a historical viewpoint. I seriously recommend to Secretary Udall that a program such as I have suggested above, should be devised in cooperation with the Job Corps.

I ask, therefore, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that each Member of this House, Republican and Democrat, join with me in support of this bill to make Ellis Island a national historic site.

## STATEMENT OF POSITION ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many are asking the question, "Why are we in Vietnam?" or "What is our policy in Vietnam?" To me, the reasons for our presence in this country are so crystal clear that I find it difficult to comprehend the confusion which now appears to exist on this subject.

We were invited into South Vietnam by the Government of that country and have never been asked to leave. We are in Vietnam because our own security and the security of the entire free world demands that a firm line be drawn against the forward advance of Communist imperialism—in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, and in Europe. We are in Vietnam not merely to help the 14 million South Vietnamese defend themselves against communism, but because what is at stake is the independence and freedom of 240 million people in southeast Asia and the future of freedom throughout the Western Pacific.

The senior Senator from Idaho and others have repeated the proposal that we should seek negotiations for the purpose of terminating the bloodshed in Vietnam and avoiding the enlargement of the war. While a most worthwhile goal, this proposal overlooks the fact that there already does exist a negotiated agreement on Vietnam, and its final declaration reads:

Each member \* \* \* undertakes to respect the sovereignty, the independence, the unity, and the territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states and to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs.

At a recent press conference, President Johnson stated:

We have had direct discussions with almost every signatory of the 1954 and 1962 pacts. We have not had any indication \* \* \* from anyone that Hanoi is prepared to stop doing what it is doing against its neighbors.

It would seem to me the only peace the Communists in this part of Asia are interested in at this point is a piece of South Vietnam.

President Johnson further illustrated the problem by quoting a friend who said:

When I see the suggestions about negotiating, I wonder if folks don't recognize that there must be someone to negotiate with, and there must be someone willing to negotiate.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD in a speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate on February 23, 1965, stated:

The defense of the free world rests on a very delicate balance. The key elements in that balance are American power and American determination. If we lack the power to maintain that balance then certainly all is lost. If we reveal that we lack the determination, if we, for instance, allow ourselves to be pushed out of Vietnam, such a humiliation may indeed be the second shot heard around the world; and a dozen nations

might soon throw in the sponge and make whatever accommodation they could with an enemy that would then seem assured of victory.

To what point would we then retreat to anchor our perimeter of Pacific defense—Pearl Harbor?

Thailand's Foreign Minister, Thanat Khoman, declared in a recent interview:

Neutrality is no longer a refuge. We have seen in Laos and India and elsewhere that neutrality does not prevent anyone from being attacked, from being subverted, from becoming a victim of aggression.

Our experience with communism has shown that the neutralization of a nation generally amounts to surrender on the installment plan.

Thanat made it plain that the thing which alarms him now is any U.S. talk, in Congress and the press, of calling it quits. He said:

Some people are saying, "Let's go back to Geneva. Let's try again." Twice in one lifetime is enough. Every time you go to Geneva you surrender to the Communists. North Vietnam and Communist China have made it plain that what they want is a complete U.S. withdrawal. They are not interested in negotiations.

South Vietnam has not asked anybody to negotiate its surrender to the Communists. I don't think we have the right to treat the South Vietnamese or the Laotians as chattels. We cannot dispose of them by international agreement.

Does anyone remember Munich, where Hitler's appetite was insatiably whetted by British concession and World War II was born?

Pote Sarasin, the longtime SEATO secretary general who is now Thailand's Minister for National Development, has stated:

I don't think the American people should limit their vision to the saving of Vietnam. I think this is a problem of saving the existing free countries of Asia. The Communists want nothing more than the complete withdrawal of American forces and bases from Asia. Yet we rely entirely on U.S. Forces and, like Malaysia with Britain, we cannot stand alone unless there is the support of the United States.

After considerable study of the issues and after listening to the President, his advisers, and other informed persons, I find myself wholeheartedly in support of the current position taken by the administration. We all hope for an early end to this frustrating struggle, but the only real solution is to convince the Communists to live up to agreements already made, not to create further agreements to be broken.

Senate Republican leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN has asserted that the United States has "blown the trumpets of retreat too long" and that it is time to take a firm stand against the Communists.

I conclude with a statement made by Senator DODD 4 years ago on the floor of the Senate following a trip to southeast Asia:

If the United States, with its unrivaled might, with its unparalleled wealth, with its dominion over sea and air, with its heritage as the champion of freedom—if this United States and its free world allies have so diminished in spirit that they can be



laid in the dust by a few thousand primitive guerrillas, then we are far down the road from which there is no return.

In right and in might, we are able to work our will on this question. Southeast Asia cannot be lost unless we will it to be lost; it cannot be saved unless we will it to be saved.

This problem, seemingly so remote and distant, will in fact be resolved here in the United States, in the Congress, in the administration, and in the minds and hearts of the American people.

#### AGENCY PROPOSED TO ASSIST LOCAL COURTS, WIVES, AND PROSECUTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation calling for a new office within the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have introduced H.R. 5358 after conferring with and receiving the advice of judges, prosecuting attorneys, and welfare officials in the 17th Ohio District. It would facilitate Federal cooperation with State and local agencies and law enforcement officials to locate individuals for whom a warrant of arrest has been issued for abandonment, desertion, or nonsupport of children.

Prosecuting attorneys and welfare agencies are hampered in their efforts to locate husbands who abandon their families because of Federal policies against divulging information as to welfare recipients, income tax, social security, and other programs. The enactment of the bill which would make the FBI a clearinghouse for information regarding runaway fathers which would help local law enforcement and welfare agencies locate these men for proper legal action.

The Federal Government should give its cooperation to these local prosecuting attorneys, courts, and especially the wives and mothers who become welfare cases because of nonsupport. Setting up this new office in the FBI would allow them to handle these requests in a manner which would otherwise protect the confidential nature of welfare rolls, income tax returns, and social security contributions.

Here is an area, Mr. Speaker, where the Federal Government can give information to local courts and prosecutors to help in law enforcement. I am not advocating the FBI become a tracer of lost persons but it does make sense to have them assist by giving information which is peculiarly Federal in nature where this information will help locate runaway fathers and husbands. H.R. 5358 is included herewith:

H.R. 5358

To establish an office within the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assist the States in locating individuals for whom a warrant of arrest has been issued for abandonment, desertion, or nonsupport of children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General shall establish within the

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, an office whose function shall be to obtain information relating to the location of certain individuals that may be in the possession of an executive department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 2. Where a warrant has been issued for the arrest of any individual under the criminal laws of the District of Columbia or any State based upon the offense of abandonment, desertion, or nonsupport of children, the prosecuting attorney of the District of Columbia or the political subdivision of such State having jurisdiction over such offense may request (in such manner, and setting forth such information, as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe) the head of the office established under the first section to obtain any information relating to the location of such individual that may be in the possession of an executive department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 3. The head of the office established under the first section is authorized to obtain from any executive department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States any information in the possession of such department, agency, or instrumentality relating to the location of an individual with respect to whom a request for information has been made under section 2. Each executive department, agency, or instrumentality relating to the location of an individual with respect to whom a request for information has been made under section 2. Each executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the head of such office for the use of the person making the request, notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the disclosure of information by such department, agency, or instrumentality unless the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality determines that such information should not be disclosed in the interests of the national security of the United States.

#### AMERICANS SHOULD BE GIVEN EVERY GUARANTEE THAT THEIR VOTES WILL BE COUNTED AND ACCURATELY TABULATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, American citizens should not only be protected in their right to vote in public elections, but they should also be given every guarantee that their votes will be counted and accurately tabulated.

I fully endorse the President's proposal that Congress enact laws that will protect the right of every qualified American citizen to vote in all National, State, and local elections. This is a right of citizenship, and no election official in any State must be allowed to obstruct Americans in the free exercise of it.

However, not only have there been instances in the past where citizens have been denied the opportunity to vote, there also have been numerous validated occurrences of vote fraud where votes have not been counted, ballot boxes have been stuffed, and tabulations of votes have been purposefully altered. It seems to me that accompanying the right to vote is a coequal right to have

the vote accurately counted, free from any possibility of fraud.

There is considerable evidence that there was a failure to count votes, that vote tabulations were rigged and manipulated, and that both nonexistent and deceased persons somehow "voted" in the 1960 elections in Cook County, Ill., and in other urban areas of the country. There should be protection against this type of outrageous activity, as well as against the denial of the right to vote; and I heartily recommend this to the President for his consideration.

The right to vote is a sacred American responsibility, and I fail to see the difference between not allowing an American in Selma, Ala., to vote, and allowing a citizen in Chicago, Ill., to vote and then not counting his ballot.

Every American—in Alabama, Illinois, Utah, or wherever—has a right to vote and an equally sacred right to have his vote counted fairly.

#### GREAT WHITE FLEET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have again in this Congress introduced legislation to create a great white fleet designed to render emergency assistance and aid on a continuing basis to coastal inhabitants of the underdeveloped world.

H.R. 2428 would amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to establish a fleet of presently mothballed vessels. The ships would be staffed by experts in the fields of health and agriculture who would visit coastal territories, in case of emergencies or otherwise, to bring needed relief.

Although the project would come under the overall directional authority of the Agency for International Development, the bill authorizes the cooperation and participation of knowledgeable private groups. The ships are available. And I have expert advice that a great number of these are readily suitable for reconditioning without prohibitive cost.

The fleet would be divided into task forces, each including a hospital ship; other vessels could be used for transport of clothing, medical supplies, and also food commodities from our surplus stock.

In order to minimize the cost of the operation, H.R. 2428 provides for maximum use of counterpart funds, presently languishing in vaults overseas.

Last July 29 I addressed the House at length on this subject. It is an idea which has long activated by interest. I earnestly hope that during this Congress, the House will give it serious consideration.

As indicated by the success of Project Hope, the white fleet can become an effective instrument in meeting hunger and deprivation abroad. It is realistic in that we will work as much as possible with the tools already available, such as food surplus, unused ships, and local currencies accumulating overseas.

4998

With this legislation we can effectively muster the knowledge and skill of our advanced society and apply it now where it is most needed throughout the world. There will be no political strings; this proposal is humanitarian in concept and application; there is no special message to the peoples of the world, except the willingness to transmit the fruits of modern medicine, technical know-how, and agricultural revolution to those most in need.

America has a moral obligation to confer upon the disadvantaged its superabundance in learning and food production; we cannot waste it, either on our own pockets of deprivation or the urgent want that is unmet abroad.

#### HOUSE REPORT NO. 144 BY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of Members to House Report No. 144, recently issued by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

This report was originally brought out, last December, as a report of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development—which it is my privilege to chair. In my judgment, it deals with a most important matter—the limitations which some of our appropriations acts place on reimbursing universities and other nonprofit institutions for overhead costs incurred in the course of work conducted through Federal research grants.

We recommend strongly that such limitations be removed in future acts for three main reasons.

First. A fixed amount of reimbursable costs results in loss of the administrative flexibility so necessary to productive working arrangements.

Second. The bookkeeping processes of the various grantee institutions are so different that the flat percentage-of-direct-costs formula imposed by statute often results in serious inequities and hardship.

Third. The statutory limitation prevents the uniformity of treatment which good administration requires and which the Bureau of the Budget is trying to bring about.

Mr. Speaker, I noted with pleasure that the President, in his budget message to the Congress this year also recommended the removal of these restrictions. His request, I think, lends urgency to the problem. Hence may I commend to all Members of the House this report of our subcommittee—"Government and Science No. 5—Indirect Costs Under Federal Research Grants"—or House Report No. 144, 89th Congress, which is identical. This report, together with the extensive hearings on the subject which we held last May and June, will provide Members with much useful information in their consideration of the issues involved.

Finally, I want to emphasize that House Report No. 144 carries the first

printed text of the Bureau of the Budget Circular A-21 as revised and promulgated after lengthy study and work. The circular contains the administration's formulas and policy for the uniform handling of overhead costs on all research grants.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CONTE, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for 60 minutes, on March 17; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for 60 minutes, on March 17; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAGGONER (at the request of Mr. COLMER), for 30 minutes, on March 17; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. YATES, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, vacating his special order for today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURTON of Utah (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. KELLY in three instances and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that in one instance the extraneous matter will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$263.50.

Mr. ULLMAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DADDARIO to follow the remarks of Mr. MILLER on his special order of today.

Mr. YATES and to include an address. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE in five instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. MORSE in four instances.

Mr. CEDERBERG in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. MATHIAS in five instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. FIRNIE in two instances.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona in five instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SICKLES.

Mr. CALLAN in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mrs. KELLY in three instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU.

Mr. YATES in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. KING of California.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. BANDSTRA in two instances.

Mr. WELTNER.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Rameib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 190. An act for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 195. An act for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 440. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 574. An act for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 618. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 642. An act for the relief of Chung K. Won; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 829. An act for the relief of Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

750. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed